

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

DANNY JOSEPH WILLIAMS,

Case No. 1:15-cv-479

Plaintiff,

Dlott, J.

vs

Bowman, M.J.

UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL, et al.,

Defendant.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On July 13, 2015, Plaintiff filed a *pro se* motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Doc. 1). On August 15, 2015, the undersigned issued a Deficiency Order because Plaintiff's motion did not include a completed *in forma pauperis* application. (Doc. 2). Plaintiff was ordered to submit a completed IFP application or pay the full filing fee of \$400 within thirty (30) days. (Doc. 2). Plaintiff also was advised that his failure to comply with the Order "will result in the dismissal of the action for want of prosecution." (*Id.*). To date, more than thirty (30) days later, Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's Order.

District courts have the inherent power to *sua sponte* dismiss civil actions for want of prosecution to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases." *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–631, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 8 L.Ed.2d 734 (1962). Though plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, as stated by the Supreme Court, "we have never suggested that procedural rules in ordinary civil litigation should be interpreted so as to excuse mistakes by those who proceed without counsel." *McNeil v. United States*, 508 U.S. 106, 113 (1993).

Accordingly, it is therefore **RECOMMENDED** that this matter be **DISMISSED** for want of prosecution and for failure to obey a Court Order.

s/ Stephanie K. Bowman
Stephanie K. Bowman
United States Magistrate Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

DANNY JOSEPH WILLIAMS,

Case No. 1:15-cv-479

Plaintiff,

Dlott, J.

vs

Bowman, M.J.

UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL, et al.,

Defendant.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to this Report & Recommendation (“R&R”) within **FOURTEEN (14) DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. That period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion by either side for an extension of time. All objections shall specify the portion(s) of the R&R objected to, and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. A party shall respond to an opponent’s objections within **FOURTEEN DAYS** after being served with a copy of those objections. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).